The problem of coexistence of several non-Hermitian observables in $\mathcal{PT}-$symmetric quantum mechanics

Miloslav Znojil, **Iveta Semorádová**, **František Ružička**,

Nuclear Physics Institute CAS, 250 68 Řež, Czech Republic,
emails: znojil@ujf.cas.cz, semoradova@ujf.cas.cz, ruzicka@ujf.cas.cz,

Hafida Moulla and **Ilhem Leghrib**

Laboratoire de Physique Mathematique et Subatomique, Mentouri University,
Constantine, Algeria,
e-mails: moullahafida@yahoo.fr and leghribilhem@gmail.com

arXiv:1610.09396v2 [quant-ph] 5 Jan 2017

Abstract

During the recent developments of quantum theory it has been clarified that the observable quantities (like energy or position) may be represented by operators Λ (with real spectra) which are manifestly non-Hermitian in a preselected "friendly" Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{(F)}$. The consistency of these models is known to require an upgrade of the inner product, i.e., mathematically speaking, a transition $\mathcal{H}^{(F)} \to \mathcal{H}^{(S)}$ to another, "standard" Hilbert space. We prove that whenever we are given more than one candidate for an observable (i.e., say, two operators Λ_0 and Λ_1) in advance, such an upgrade *need not* exist in general.

1 Introduction

In 2009 one of us (MZ, in the role of the guest editor of a special issue [1] dedicated, mainly, to $\mathcal{PT}-$symmetric quantum mechanics, PTSQM) witnessed a controversy between the two groups of contributing authors (cf. Refs. [2, 3]). The papers were devoted, basically, to non-Hermitian minimal-length quantum models in which one has to establish a conceptually consistent coexistence of a non-Hermitian Hamiltonian $H \neq H^\dagger$ with a non-Hermitian-operator representation of the coordinate $X \neq X^\dagger$.

The controversy did not come to any final resolution, originally just due to the strictness of the deadlines of the submissions to the special issue. Nevertheless, seven years later, during a summer school [4], the same – still unresolved – problem of the coexistence of $H \neq H^\dagger$ with $X \neq X^\dagger$ re-emerged. In two posters (by two of us, viz, by HM and IL, cf. [5, 6]) it was emphasized that the proof or disproof of the compatibility of H and X would be desirable, important and topical.

An explanation and a few answers to these questions will be found in what follows. Indeed, during our recent deeper study of the problem we found a key to its resolution in a clarification of several existing misunderstandings as well as, whenever needed, in an appropriate simplification of the mathematical aspects of the whole puzzle.

The presentation of our results will be preceded by a concise outline of the broader quantum-theory context in section 2 and by a concise outline of the PTSQM formalism in section 3. The formulation of the non-Hermitian compatibility problem will follow in section 4. For illustration we mention there the triviality of the case in which the two preselected observables H (or, more generally, any non-Hermitian operator A *alias* Λ_0 with real spectrum) and X (*alias* B or Λ_1) commute (subsection 4.1). Subsequently, in subsection 4.2 we deliver the proof of the incompatibility of the entirely generic Λ_0 with the entirely generic Λ_1 (which does not commute with the former one of course), assuming only, for simplicity, that the Hilbert spaces in question are finite-dimensional.

Basically, the latter result means that the well known (and, in general, ambiguous, [7]) assignment of a proper probabilistic interpretation to a *single* preselected non-self-adjoint N by N matrix of an observable $A \neq A^\dagger$ need not necessarily admit the acceptability of another, independent N by N matrix of another candidate $B \neq B^\dagger$ for an observable in the same quantum system. In other words, we will be able to conclude that in a generic situation, the arbitrarily selected doublet of non-Hermitian operators A and B with real spectra *cannot* be immediately treated as representing a pair of the observable quantities. For a coexistence, the operators must be nontrivially interconnected.

The discussion of the practical applicability aspects of our present contribution is initiated in section 5. We recall there, for illustration purposes, the weakly $q-$deformed version

of one of the above-mentioned models (subsection 5.1). Next we show how the required compatibility conditions become simplified in the first-order perturbation approximation (subsection 5.2). Subsequently (i.e., in section 6) a few technical difficulties associated with the construction of the metric itself are discussed for the single generic input observable Λ_0 (subsection 6.1) and in the situation in which one adds another operator, Λ_1 (subsection 6.2). Section 7 is finally devoted to a few mathematical subtleties, i.e., more explicitly, to the role of the boundedness of the operators of observables (cf. subsection 7.1), to the merits of the combination of the perturbation and truncation strategies (listed in subsection 7.2) and to the explicit and exhaustive illustrative description of the compatibility criteria at $N = 2$ in subsection 7.3. The summary of our message is finally provided by section 8.

2 Context and motivation

The traditional method of building the quantum phenomenological models is based on the so called principle of correspondence. In this spirit one *tentatively* replaces the classical observable quantities λ (sampled, say, by the kinetic energy $p^2/2m$ or by the position q of a massive non-relativistic free point particle) by suitable operators Λ. The replacement is conceptually most straightforward in the so called Heisenberg picture in which every admissible state of the quantum system in question is represented by a time-independent wave-function element ψ of a preselected "Heisenberg's" physical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{(H)}$. The operators $\Lambda = \Lambda^{(H)}(t)$ themselves then vary with time in a way prescribed by the well known Heisenberg evolution equations [8, 9].

It is well known that the practical measurable predictions of quantum theory are usually produced after an entirely routine change of the language and after the replacement of the Heisenberg picture by its equivalent Schrödinger-picture alternative. The typical operators of observables then become stationary ($\Lambda^{(S)} \neq \Lambda^{(S)}(t)$) while the whole information about the evolution becomes carried by the Schrödinger-picture wave functions $\psi = \psi(t) \in \mathcal{H}^{(S)}$. The well known time-dependent Schrödinger equation $\mathrm{i}\partial_t\psi(t) = H\,\psi(t)$ then contains the Hamiltonian operator H which may be assumed, for the sake of simplicity, time-independent.

Recently, a thoroughly amended version of the Schrödinger picture (to be called, in what follows, "$\mathcal{PT}-$symmetric quantum mechanics", PTSQM) has been developed and made popular by Bender with coauthors (cf., e.g., the detailed summaries of the idea in [10, 11] or in several slightly more mathematics-oriented concise reviews as collected in the newest book [12]). Incidentally, the whole new approach (in which the Hamiltonian was assumed $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetric rather than Hermitian, with parity $\mathcal{P}$ and time-reversal $\mathcal{T}$) looked so unusual that different groups of authors were not even able to accept a unified terminol-

ogy. Partially, this was caused by the fact that the origin of the idea may be dated back to Freeman Dyson [13] and/or to Jean Dieudonné [14] who, unfortunately, did not recommend any specific terminology. Thus, one reveals several more or less equivalent forms of the "non-Hermitian Schrödinger picture" in the Dyson's effective models of ferromagnets [13], in the interacting boson models of heavy nuclei (in nuclear physics the variational form of the so called "quasi-Hermitian" version of the theory proved particularly successful [7]) as well as in the context of quantum field theory.

In the latter setting the emphasis was put upon the specific use of the auxiliary parity-time *alias* $\mathcal{PT}-$symmetry [15]. This made the approach most widely understood and accepted [10]. More recently, the enhancement of efficiency of such a more sophisticated model-building strategy found a new use in relativistic quantum mechanics where another alternative concept of the "pseudo-Hermitian representation of quantum mechanics" [11] seems to have found its particularly transparent formal roots in elementary linear algebra.

In this perspective our present new methodical contribution to the further development of the formalism found its immediate predecessor in paper [16]. One of us proposed there a prototype quantum toy model in which the mathematical compatibility between the *two* non-Hermitian but $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetric observables (viz., between a non-Hermitian Hamiltonian and a non-Hermitian spin projection) has been guaranteed by their mutual commutativity. Overrestrictive as the commutativity constraint might be, it found its inspiration in a few other commutativity-requiring constructions where the pairs of non-Hermitian observables were specified as the Hamiltonian plus the so called quasi-parity [17] or as the Hamiltonian plus the so called charge [18, 19].

In our present paper we intend to change the perspective and to reanalyze the operator-pair compatibility problem from an opposite point of view in which the two *entirely independent* non-Hermitian candidates for observables (say, Λ_1 and Λ_2, with real spectra) are assumed given in advance. In such a case the commutativity constraint $[\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2] = 0$ may be expected to be replaced by certain more sophisticated *ad hoc* conditions (cf., e.g., their various samples in review [7] or in the series of constructive papers [2, 3, 20, 21]).

We believe that up to now, a more systematic, model-independent study of the non-Hermitian compatibility problem was not published. This gap is to be filled in what follows. In particular, we shall demonstrate that there exists a subtle correspondence between the choice of the so called irreducible sets of the candidates Λ_j for the observables (cf. the Appendix of Ref. [7] for a deeper mathematical commentary) and the role played by these sets in the removal of the well known ambiguity of the assignment of the Schrödinger-picture Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{(S)}$ to a *single* observable Λ_0 (cf., e.g., Ref. [22] for a rather formal but fairly exhaustive technical discussion of the latter topic).

3 A concise outline of the theory

3.1 The Dyson's quantum mechanics *in nuce*

Before going into technical details let us emphasize that we shall perceive the PTSQM approach as fully compatible with the traditional textbooks on quantum mechanics [8]. A more detailed explanation of this point of view may be found summarized in papers [23] or reviews [7, 11, 24]. In a way inspired also by Refs. [13, 14] we will characterize the PTSQM as a representation of quantum systems in which the use of the "standard" Hilbert space of states $\mathcal{H}^{(S)}$ (in which the observables are represented by the self-adjoint operators, $\Lambda = \Lambda^{\ddagger}$) can be *paralleled* by the use of another, unphysical but mathematically friendlier Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{(F)}$. In the latter space the *same* observables appear non-Hermitian of course, $\Lambda \neq \Lambda^{\dagger}$, due to the underlying auxiliary *intentional simplification* of the inner product.

Table 1: Non-Hermitian version of Schrödinger picture (cf. [24]).

the triplet of representation Hilbert spaces:		
$\mathcal{H}^{(F)}$	$\mathcal{H}^{(S)}$	$\mathcal{H}^{(T)}$
= the first one,	= the second one,	= the third one,
false space,	standard space	of textbooks,
unphysical		inaccessible
the purpose of their simultaneous use:		
the friendlier	the correct space	the friendlier
mathematical ↙		↘ probabilistic
representation		interpretation
formally, the generic observable is, respectively,		
non-Hermitian	self-adjoint	self-adjoint
$(\Lambda \neq \Lambda^{\dagger})$	$(\Lambda = \Lambda^{\ddagger})$	(transformed)

The structure of the resulting "three-Hilbert-space" (THS) Schrödinger-picture pattern is summarized in Table 1. A key to the understanding of such an innovative and, apparently, redundant representation of a quantum system may be seen in the Dyson-inspired conjecture [13] that one need not distinguish between the predictions made within the standard physical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{(S)}$ and within any other, unitarily equivalent alternative Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{(T)}$ "of textbooks".

In the context of applications the Dyson's recipe was successful in nuclear physics where one always knows the self-adjoint Hamiltonian in $\mathcal{H}^{(T)}$. Once this operator is found overcomplicated, one is well motivated to change the Hilbert space as well as to simplify

the Hamiltonian. This may be achieved via certain *ad hoc*, intuition-based and invertible $\mathcal{H}^{(F)} \to \mathcal{H}^{(T)}$ mapping, to be called the Dyson's map and to be denoted by the dedicated symbol Ω in what follows.

3.2 The $\mathcal{PT}-$symmetric quantum mechanics *in nuce*

In the newly developed PTSQM setting the situation proved more complicated because the old Dyson's recipe was inverted (cf., e.g., review paper [10] for numerous illustrations). Thus, in the first step one just picks up an auxiliary Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{(F)}$ together with a sufficiently elementary (quite often, just ordinary-differential-operator) non-Hermitian but $\mathcal{PT}-$symmetric candidate H for the Hamiltonian.

In the subsequent steps the preselected Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{(F)}$ is declared "false". For the correct physical interpretation purposes it is to be replaced by another, "second" Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{(S)}$. In the latter, non-equivalent, $S-$superscripted Hilbert space the initial non-Hermitian operators H of Hamiltonians must be self-adjoint. Thus, one might write

$$H = H^{\ddagger}\,. \tag{1}$$

Unfortunately, the acceptance of such a convention would not be too fortunate. In many applications of the theory the *direct* use of the second, $S-$superscripted Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{(S)}$ would be misleading. Fortunately, its immediate use is also not necessary because via a mere redefinition of the inner product we may *always* postpone the study of Eq. (1) and stay working inside $\mathcal{H}^{(F)}$ [11]. This is also the assumption from which the manifest (albeit purely artificial) non-Hermiticity of the operators of the observables emerges, $H \neq H^{\dagger}$ in $\mathcal{H}^{(F)}$.

A return to the Hermiticity property (1) is not difficult. It can most immediately be mediated by the replacement of formula (1) valid in $\mathcal{H}^{(S)}$ by *the same* formula re-written (i.e., represented) in $\mathcal{H}^{(F)}$,

$$H = \Theta^{-1} H^{\dagger} \Theta\,, \qquad \Theta = \Omega^{\dagger}\Omega\,. \tag{2}$$

The operator Θ is usually called the physical Hilbert-space metric. A virtually exhaustive though still not too formalistic list of the related mathematical details may be found, e.g., in [7].

The preference of Eq. (2) suppresses many misunderstandings. First of all, we may keep writing the "false", $F-$superscripted inner products in the standard Dirac's bra-ket notation,

$$[\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle]^{(F)} \;\equiv\; \langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle\,. \tag{3}$$

Secondly, the representation of the other, physical, $S-$superscripted inner products may be given virtually equally friendly form in its friendlier $F-$space representation,

$$[\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle]^{(S)} \ \equiv \ \langle\psi_1|\Theta|\psi_2\rangle\,. \tag{4}$$

In the spirit of review [24] one can also introduce the doubled bra and the doubled ket symbols and abbreviate $\Theta|\psi\rangle \equiv |\psi\rangle\!\rangle$ and $\langle\psi|\Theta \equiv \langle\!\langle\psi|$. Although such a convention is fairly unusual (and it will not be used too much in the bulk text of this paper), its use can make the formalism more transparent. First of all, the set of special ketkets $|n_0\rangle\!\rangle$ can be introduced as a set of eigenvectors of the conjugate Hamiltonian, $H^\dagger|n_0\rangle\!\rangle = E_n\,|n_0\rangle\!\rangle$. As a consequence one can endow the Hamiltonian operator H with the menu of *all* of its eligible Hermitizing metrics,

$$\Theta = \sum_n |n_0\rangle\!\rangle\kappa_n\langle\!\langle n_0| = \Theta(\vec{\kappa})\,. \tag{5}$$

The coefficients κ_n are variable and the sequence of their values must be kept real, positive and properly bounded [22].

4 The operator-compatibility conditions

4.1 The case of commuting pairs of non-Hermitian observables

The Hilbert-space-metric operator Θ (with multiple necessary mathematical properties [7, 25, 26, 27, 28] which were not mentioned here for the sake of brevity) enables one to pull back the $S-$space formula (1) to its explicit equivalent representation (2) in $F-$space. Naturally, the correspondence between the left eigenvectors and the general Hermitizing metric operators applies to the Hamiltonian $H = \Lambda_0$ as well as to any other non-Hermitian candidate Λ_j for the operator of an observable. Via an analogue of formula (5), any such an operator can be assigned, *mutatis mutandis*, an exhaustive menu of eligible metrics

$$\Theta = \sum_n |n_j\rangle\!\rangle\kappa_n^{(j)}\langle\!\langle n_j| = \Theta_j(\overrightarrow{\kappa^{(j)}})\,. \tag{6}$$

In this sense, our present research subject can briefly be characterized, in its first nontrivial version with $j = 0$ and $j = 1$ in Eq. (6), as the analysis of the operator twin-observability constraint

$$\Theta_0(\overrightarrow{\kappa^{(0)}}) = \Theta_1(\overrightarrow{\kappa^{(1)}})\,. \tag{7}$$

As we already mentioned, just the trivial versions of the solution of this relation are usually considered in the literature. For example, once we recall that the shared eigenvalues E_n of $\Lambda_0 = H$ and of $\Lambda_0^\dagger = H^\dagger$ are, by assumption, real, we may decide to complement our

knowledge of the eigenketkets $|n_0\rangle\!\rangle$ of the conjugate $H^\dagger$ by the standard eigenkets $|n_0\rangle$ of H. In this way we can obtain a biorthonormalized basis [29] and a spectral-like formula

$$H = \sum_n |n_0\rangle\, E_n\, \langle\!\langle n_0| \,. \tag{8}$$

Moreover, if we introduce another operator $\Lambda_1 \neq \Lambda_1^\dagger$ with real spectrum and such that

$$\Lambda_1 = \sum_n |n_1\rangle\, b_n\, \langle\!\langle n_1| \,, \tag{9}$$

it is natural to assume that the related biorthonormal basis is different and that the new operator does not commute with the old one in general.

Once we now decide to impose the simplifying condition of the commutativity, i.e., of the coincidence of the two eigenbases in formulae

$$\Lambda_0^{(special)} = \sum_n |n\rangle\, a_n\, \langle\!\langle n| \,, \qquad \Lambda_1^{(special)} = \sum_n |n\rangle\, b_n\, \langle\!\langle n| \tag{10}$$

we find that such an assumption proves too strong. Indeed, it immediately converts the compatibility condition (7) into an identity. In the light of Appendix of Ref. [7] the introduction of the new observable does not remove the ambiguity from the metric (5) at all. The free variability of the whole multiplet of parameters $\vec{\kappa}$ survives. In the terminology of review [7], the set of the two observables (10) remains reducible.

Let us now exclude the fully degenerate scenario of Eq. (10) as trivial and let us assume that the two biorthonormal bases entering spectral expansions (8) and (9) do not coincide. As a consequence, the operator-coincidence (7) will restrict the variability of the coefficients in Eq. (5). Too much, perhaps: One immediately notices that the number of the constraints which are generated by Eq. (7) seems to be *too large* for the purpose in general.

Certainly, the problem deserves a deeper and more concrete critical analysis.

4.2 The case of non-commutative non-Hermitian observables

A priori we may expect that the metric $\Theta(\Lambda_0, \Lambda_1)$ can only exist under certain constraints represented, formally, by the solvability of Eq. (7). Unfortunately, the knowledge of these constraints will be usually difficult to extract in practice. This makes our present task (i.e., the explicit critical analysis) rather nontrivial.

During the very first step of our search for a guarantee of the existence of at least one acceptable metric we reveal that in contrast to the comparatively popular suppressions of the ambiguity of Θ (cf., e.g., their extensive discussion in [7]), the danger of the nonexistence of *any* metric is often underestimated in the literature. For example, the authors

of Ref. [20] took the existence of $\Theta(\Lambda_0, \Lambda_1)$ (as well as its uniqueness), rather naively, for granted. Indeed, they considered, in an entirely general setting, "a definite form of the Hamiltonian H" (i.e., in our notation, of the first operator Λ_0) "and an additional observable" (i.e., another operator Λ_1). Then they claimed, *expressis verbis*, that "these two choices ... will fix the metric uniquely, such that there are no ambiguities left in the interpretation of the physical observables" [20].

For a technically feasible critical analysis of such a claim let us, first of all, skip certain less essential mathematical subtleties and let us restrict attention to the models living in finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces, specifying, for the sake of definiteness, $\mathcal{H}^{(F)} = \mathbb{C}^N$. In this case we may use *any* suitable basis and we may treat our operators Λ_0, Λ_1, ... as the respective complex N by N matrices $A = A^{(N)}$, $B = B^{(N)}$, ...

Once we abbreviate, in parallel, $\overrightarrow{\kappa^{(0)}} = \overrightarrow{\alpha}$ and $\overrightarrow{\kappa^{(10)}} = \overrightarrow{\beta}$, the respective metrics in Eq. (7) may be perceived as the well defined Hermitian-matrix functions of the real and positive variables. This enables us to rewrite Eq. (7) as the algebraic set

$$\Theta^{(A)}_{mn}(\overrightarrow{\alpha}) = \Theta^{(B)}_{mn}(\overrightarrow{\beta}), \qquad m, n = 1, 2, \ldots, N \tag{11}$$

of N^2 linear equations. In such a setting the left-hand-side matrix with eigenvalues $\theta^{(A)}_n(\overrightarrow{\alpha})$ may be diagonalized by a suitable unitary matrix $U(\overrightarrow{\alpha})$. This yields an equivalent set of relations

$$\theta^{(A)}_n(\overrightarrow{\alpha})\delta_{mn} = \Big[U(\overrightarrow{\alpha})\,\Theta^{(B)}(\overrightarrow{\beta})U^{\dagger}(\overrightarrow{\alpha})\Big]_{mn}, \qquad m, n = 1, 2, \ldots, N\,. \tag{12}$$

For an arbitrary "input" choice of the $N-$plet of variable parameters α_n this certainly provides the $N-$plet of constraints

$$\theta^{(A)}_n(\overrightarrow{\alpha}) = \Big[U(\overrightarrow{\alpha})\,\Theta^{(B)}(\overrightarrow{\beta})U^{\dagger}(\overrightarrow{\alpha})\Big]_{nn}, \qquad n = 1, 2, \ldots, N \tag{13}$$

which may be read as an implicit-function definition of the "output" $N-$plet of quantities $\beta_n = \beta_n(\overrightarrow{\alpha})$.

We are now left with the remaining independent $N(N-1)/2$ conditions forming the upper triangular matrix in (12) and reflecting the presence of the left-hand-side zeros,

$$\Big[U(\overrightarrow{\alpha})\,\Theta^{(B)}(\overrightarrow{\beta}(\overrightarrow{\alpha}))U^{\dagger}(\overrightarrow{\alpha})\Big]_{mn} = 0\,, \qquad m = n+1, n+2, \ldots, N\,, \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots, N-1\,. \tag{14}$$

We see that our remaining available $N-$plet of the real and positive variables $\overrightarrow{\alpha}$ is constrained by the overdetermined set of the $N(N-1)/2$ complex (i.e., of the $N(N-1)$ real) nonlinear algebraic equations. In the generic case one can use the roughmost estimate of the number of solutions and conclude that at $N > 2$ the nontrivial real and positive roots α_n need not exist at all. Indeed, the number of equations (14) will not exceed the number of unknowns only when $N(N-1) \leq N$, i.e., at $N \leq 2$.

In the opposite direction the requirement of the existence of at least one real and positive $N-$plet of parameters α_n necessarily imposes certain nontrivial restrictions upon our freedom of the choice of the "dynamical input" operators A and B. Naturally, the latter set of restrictions becomes perceivably more stringent when one decides to accommodate more than two "dynamical input" operators Λ_j with $j \leq j_{max} > 1$. At the same time, our theoretical ambitions should not be exaggerated. Thus, for $j_{max} \gg 1$ at least, it seems to make good sense to follow the common practice of the traditional textbooks where, typically, a trivial unit-matrix metric $\Theta = I$ is chosen and fixed in advance.

In the present generalized setting the acceptance of the same philosophy will merely mean that one simplifies the strategy and picks up and fixes a suitable nontrivial initial matrix $\Theta^{(A)} \neq I$. In this framework one then admits only those additional observables which obey the Dieudonné's quasi-Hermiticity condition

$$\Lambda_j \Theta^{(A)} = \Theta^{(A)} \Lambda_j^\dagger \tag{15}$$

in $\mathcal{H}^{(F)}$ (cf. Eq. (2)), i.e., the hidden-Hermiticity requirement $\Lambda_j = \Lambda_j^\ddagger$ in the fixed physical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{(S)}$.

5 Applications of the theory

On the basis of the results of the preceding section one comes to the conclusion that the *sufficient* relations as sampled by Eq. (10) might prove insufficiently general. At the same time, a less restrictive and more general $N \leq \infty$ formula (14) is too implicit for being useful in practice. Hence, only the study of specific toy models can lead to some more definite conclusions.

5.1 The weakly deformed oscillator algebras

One of the less known sources of the current physical interest in the use of non-selfadjoint observables may be traced back to the discoveries [30] that the uncertainty relations for positions and momenta acquire rather unusual forms after a tentative replacement of the solvable harmonic oscillator by its suitable $q-$deformed analogues. In a way related to the Connes' phenomenology-oriented conjecture of making the geometry non-commutative [31], these developments had a perceivable impact also upon quantum physics [20, 32].

A typical build up of quantum models of this type starts from Heisenberg algebra. A coordinate x and momentum p or, alternatively, an annihilation operator a and a creation operator a^+ may be deformed, typically, in such a way that $(a, a^+) \to (\widehat{a}, \widehat{a}^+)$ and

$$\widehat{a}\widehat{a}^+ - q\widehat{a}^+\widehat{a} \;\equiv\; \left[\widehat{a}, \widehat{a}^+\right]_q = 1\,. \tag{16}$$

Some of the complications become simplified in a vicinity of the zero-deformation limit $q = 1$, i.e., at small $\varepsilon = q - 1 \neq 0$. One may recall Eq. (16), ignore the higher-order corrections and construct, in a simplified leading-order approximation,

$$\widehat{a} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\widehat{X}_q + i\widehat{P}_q\right) = a + \frac{1}{4}\,\varepsilon\, a^+ a^2 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)\,, \tag{17}$$

$$\widehat{a}^+ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\widehat{X}_q - i\widehat{P}_q\right) = a^+ + \frac{1}{4}\,\varepsilon\, a^{+^2} a + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)\,. \tag{18}$$

For illustration purposes one may then rewrite the Hamiltonian of the deformed harmonic oscillator in its perturbation-approximation form

$$A = \widehat{H_q} = \widehat{P}_q^2 + \widehat{X}_q^2 = H_0 + \frac{1}{8}\,\varepsilon\, H_1 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)\,. \tag{19}$$

The standard textbook harmonic oscillator Hamiltonian $H_0 = p^2 + x^2 = H_0^\dagger$ is, in the leading-order approximation, complemented by a manifestly non-selfadjoint *alias* non-Hermitian interaction operator

$$H_1 = 2x^4 - x^2 + 3p^2 - 3 + 2ix^3p + 2ixp^3 + 2x^2p^2 - 8ixp \;\neq\; H_1^\dagger\,. \tag{20}$$

Such a model was studied in [5] and its spectrum was found, in the leading-order approximation, real.

The criteria of the possible coexistence of the observability, say, of the Hamiltonian (i.e., operator $A = \widehat{H_q}$) and of the coordinate (operator $B = \widehat{X_q}$) itself remained, understandably, unresolved (cf. also Refs. [20] and [6] in a slightly different context). Still, we remain interested because the smallness of the corrections could help us to simplify the analysis of the overcomplicated operator-compatibility constraint (7).

5.2 The perturbative Hermitizability of $A \neq A^\dagger$ and $B \neq B^\dagger$

The exclusive observability of the $q-$deformed Hamiltonian $A = \widehat{H_q} \neq A^\dagger$ is not satisfactory because its study originated from the attempted upgrades of the spatial geometry [32, 33]. The Hermitization of the Hamiltonian *should* be accompanied by the equally relevant Hermitization of the operator of the coordinate

$$B = \widehat{X}_q = x + \frac{1}{8}\,\varepsilon\,\left(x^3 - xp^2 + ix^2 + ix^2p - x + ip^3 + pxp + p^2x\right) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)\,. \tag{21}$$

In a slightly more general setting we may even try to work with a multiplet of observables $\widehat{\Lambda}_j$ where $\widehat{\Lambda}_0 = A = H$, $\widehat{\Lambda}_1 = B$, etc. All of these operators of observables must, naturally, satisfy the respective observability constraints,

$$\widehat{\Lambda}_j = \widehat{\Lambda}_j^\ddagger \;\equiv\; \Theta^{-1}\widehat{\Lambda}_j^\dagger\,\Theta\,, \qquad j = 0, 1, \ldots, j_{max}\,. \tag{22}$$

This is an exemplification of relations which we already discussed above. These relations must *all* contain *the same* physical metric operator Θ.

In the special limit of the infinitesimally small non-Hermiticities it is nontrivial to guarantee the existence of at least one formal set of quantities β_n, α_n, Θ, A and B which would be compatible with the twin-observability condition (11). In the leading-order approximation one can feel inspired by the above-mentioned toy-model and one can also consider, in the spirit of Eqs. (19) and (21), the N by N matrices

$$A = A_0 + \varepsilon\, A_1 + \dots\,, \qquad A_0 = A_0^\dagger \tag{23}$$

and

$$B = B_0 + \varepsilon\, B_1 + \dots\,, \qquad B_0 = B_0^\dagger \tag{24}$$

of the relevant observables.

Whenever needed, the latter ansatz could be generalized to a higher-order precision and/or to a larger number of operators $j_{max} > 1$. For its current $j_{max} = 1$ form, our task may be now formulated as the construction of the leading-order metric

$$\Theta = I + \varepsilon\, F + \dots\,, \qquad F = F^\dagger\,. \tag{25}$$

The latter operator must make *both* of the input operators A and B of observables compatible, within given precision, with the respective hidden-Hermiticity constraints (22). Thus, the following two commutator-containing equations

$$A_0\, F - F\, A_0 = A_1 - A_1^* \;\equiv\; \mathrm{i}\, R\,, \qquad R = R^\dagger\,, \tag{26}$$

$$B_0\, F - F\, B_0 = B_1 - B_1^* \;\equiv\; \mathrm{i}\, S\,, \qquad S = S^\dagger \tag{27}$$

are to be solved for the unknown complex first-order metric-operator component $F = F^\dagger$. Obviously, due to the use of the perturbation theory, their form is perceivably simpler than that of their non-perturbative predecessors (7) and (11).

6 Difficulties associated with the perturbative construction of the metric at $N = \infty$

6.1 The single-observable problem

Without a pre-selected Θ the constructive treatment of the observability constraints (22) is, in general, difficult [34]. Fortunately, people are often interested only in the observability of the Hamiltonian,

$$\widehat{H_q} = \Theta^{-1}\,\widehat{H_q}^{\,\dagger}\,\Theta\,. \tag{28}$$

In practice, the analysis of this equation is still often facilitated by several additional assumptions. Among them, the restriction to bounded operators is mathematically the most important one (cf. [7] or [28]). Another postulate, remarkably efficient in applications, introduces the auxiliary $\mathcal{PT}-$symmetry property (cf. [35]) which is equivalent (cf. the comments in [36] or [37]) to the relation $\widehat{H_q}^\dagger \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}\widehat{H_q}$ where $\mathcal{P}$ denotes the operator of parity (or, in mathematics, the pseudometric in Krein space [37]).

In the related constructions of the acceptable physical theories one has to proceed step-by-step and one has to separate the set of the mathematical requirements into feasible, preparatory subsets. Even on the level of these preparatory considerations one encounters a number of more or less difficult obstacles. Let us now sample a few of them, for illustration.

Firstly, once we turn attention from the Hamiltonian of Eq. (28), say, to the coordinate of Eq. (21) with property

$$\widehat{X}_q^+ = \widehat{X_q} + \frac{\varepsilon}{8}\left(2xp^2 - ix^2p - 2ip^3 - 2p^2x - ipx^2\right) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2) \tag{29}$$

we may recall constraint (22), i.e.,

$$X_q^+ = \Theta X_q \Theta^{-1} \tag{30}$$

and we may search for such a form of the metric which would be positive, invertible and factorizable,

$$\Theta = \Omega^+\Omega\,. \tag{31}$$

On a purely algebraic level one of such formal solutions can be found and expressed as an exponential,

$$\Theta_0 = e^{\varepsilon f(x,p)+\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)} = 1 + \varepsilon f\,(x,p) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2) \tag{32}$$

with

$$f\,(x,p) = \frac{1}{4}\left[\frac{1}{4}\left(x^2p^2 + p^4 + p^2x^2\right) + \frac{i}{3}\left(xp^3 - p^3x\right)\right]\,. \tag{33}$$

Obviously, such a solution signals several warnings at once. It is not acceptable, first of all, because of its unboundedness [38]. In the next paragraph, we shall still study the elementary algebraic consistency between Eqs. (30) and (32). We shall show that this feature, nontrivial as it is, cannot still render, in disagreement with intuitive expectations [5, 20], the Hamiltonian selfadjoint.

6.2 Failures of the Hermitization

According to the expectations inspired by Refs.-[2, 3, 5, 20] and [21] the single-observable construction of preceding paragraph *could* suffice for the necessary Hermitization of the Hamiltonian. In other words, the use of the most common special mapping

$$\widehat{H_q} \;\to\; \mathfrak{h}_0 = \Omega_0 \widehat{H_q} \Omega_0^{-1} \tag{34}$$

with the widely recommended [11] choice of the square-root form of $\Omega_0 = \sqrt{\Theta_0}$ *might* still yield a *manifestly Hermitian* partner Hamiltonian $\mathfrak{h}_0 = \mathfrak{h}_0^\dagger$ acting in $\mathcal{H}^{(T)}$.

Although the analysis of this hypothesis is far from easy, we used the straightforward evaluation of the difference $\triangle = \mathfrak{h}_0 - \mathfrak{h}_0^\dagger$ and we arrived at the falsification of the hypothesis, $\triangle \neq 0$. The validity of our observation has been also reconfirmed via its computer-assisted verification [39]. One can conclude that the coordinate-Hermitizing Dyson-mapping operator

$$\Omega_0 = e^{\varepsilon g(x,p)+\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)} = 1 + \varepsilon g\,(x,p) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2) \tag{35}$$

with

$$g\,(x,p) = \frac{1}{8}\left[\frac{1}{4}\left(x^2p^2 + p^4 + p^2x^2\right) + \frac{i}{3}\left(xp^3 - p^3x\right)\right] \tag{36}$$

does not Hermitize the Hamiltonian. This disproves the hypothesis. Moreover, this also reopens the methodical question of the possibility of formulation of the criteria of the non-existence, existence and/or uniqueness of a shared metric Θ, for some two pre-selected candidates for physical quantum observables A and B at least.

7 A few remarks on the perturbative construction of the metric at finite $N < \infty$

Using a toy model we re-confirmed, in subsection 6.1, the well known fact [25, 34] that even in the case of the single given observable $A \neq A^\dagger$ with real spectrum and even in the not too complicated models with an infinitesimally small non-Hermiticity the construction of a correct Hermitizing physical metric Θ may be a formidable task.

7.1 Models with the bounded-operator observables A, B, ...

Naturally, the existence, number and construction of the solutions Θ specified by Eqs. (14) or (26) + (27) will all vary with the dynamical input A, B, ... One of the best analyses of these possibilities was presented in [7], i.e., paradoxically, in one of the oldest papers published on the subject. Unfortunately, the assumptions made in *loc. cit.* (and, in particular, the restriction of the scope of the paper to the bounded operators of observables) may be greeted (it renders the mathematics entirely reliable and rigorous) as well as damned. Indeed, the assumption excludes many models due to the unbounded nature of their observables.

What is truly unpleasant is that all of the attempts of getting rid of the latter technical assumption of boundedness failed. For illustration one may recall, e.g., the numerous no-go conclusions as deduced by Dieudonné [14]. More recently, the Siegl's and Krejcirik's

criticism [25] applied to some of the most popular local-potential toy models. Still, the case is not lost. The recent progress achieved at the cost of a perceivable increase of complexity of mathematics is promising (for one of the most persuasive illustrations see [28]).

7.2 N by N complex-matrix observables A, B, ...

Even in the Hilbert spaces of a finite dimension $N < \infty$ the analysis of the generic $A - B$ compatibility conditions (14) or (26)+(27) remains far from easy. What is encouraging is that this analysis might be assisted by the computers and that it may rely upon the standard linear-algebra tools. There still remains some space for a few additional, more or less purely methodical considerations. Thus, firstly, various finite-dimensional complex-matrix special cases of Eqs. (26) and (27) may be considered as approximating realistic scenarios. For example, in the most common (and suitably truncated) harmonic-oscillator basis, both of our respective toy-model exemplifications (20) and (21) of A_0 and B_0 will be sparse matrices.

One might ask whether the truncation of bases could clarify the questions of the existence of the metric in the limit $N \to \infty$. In the hypothetical case of an affirmative answer, the recipe could render the construction of F feasible. The analysis could be also performed in an opposite direction, i.e., the existence of the metric may be required in advance. Then one can deduce the necessary conditions and constraints imposed upon the pair of perturbations A_1 and B_1.

For the latter purpose it makes sense to split the complex N by N matrices in the real and imaginary parts. Once we use subscripts $_s$ and $_a$ marking, respectively, the symmetric and antisymmetric real matrices, the input information encoded in the Hermitian, complex N by N matrices

$$A_0 = A_s + \mathrm{i}A_a\,, \quad B_0 = B_s + \mathrm{i}B_a\,, \quad R = R_s + \mathrm{i}R_a\,, \quad S_0 = S_s + \mathrm{i}S_a \tag{37}$$

should now generate the desirable ultimate Hermitian matrix solution $F = F_s + \mathrm{i}F_a$ via Eqs. (26)+(27), i.e., with commutators in the real-matrix relations

$$[A_s, F_s] - [A_a, F_a] = -R_a \qquad [A_a, F_s] + [A_s, F_a] = R_s \tag{38}$$

and

$$[B_s, F_s] - [B_a, F_a] = -S_a \qquad [B_a, F_s] + [B_s, F_a] = S_s\,. \tag{39}$$

We may recall the symmetries/antisymmetries of matrices and omit the diagonal (i.e., trivially satisfied) part of the first items in both Eqs. (38) and (39). Using an arbitrary ordering of all of the independent and nontrivial matrix elements this enables us to re-arrange

the upper triangular part of all of the $_a-$subscripted upper-case real and antisymmetric N by N matrices into the respective $M-$dimensional lower-case column vectors with $M = N(N-1)/2$ (i.e., we replace R_a by, say, $\vec{r}^{(M)}$, etc). Similarly, with $V = N(N+1)/2$ we compress the information carried by the real and symmetric upper-case N by N matrix R_s to a lower-case vector $\vec{r}^{(V)}$, etc. This means that we take the upper triangular part of any $_s-$subscripted matrix and we replace it by its real $V-$dimensional column-vector representation.

This procedure eliminates the redundancy and preserves the linearity of Eqs. (38) and (39). Using the self-explanatory abbreviation for commutators we may finally convert the equations into their respective compact final versions

$$L^{(VV)}_{(A)}\vec{f}^{(V)} + L^{(VM)}_{(A)}\vec{f}^{(M)} = \vec{r}^{(V)}\,, \qquad L^{(MV)}_{(A)}\vec{f}^{(V)} - L^{(MM)}_{(A)}\vec{f}^{(M)} = -\vec{r}^{(M)} \tag{40}$$

and

$$L^{(VV)}_{(B)}\vec{f}^{(V)} + L^{(VM)}_{(B)}\vec{f}^{(M)} = \vec{s}^{(V)}\,, \qquad L^{(MV)}_{(B)}\vec{f}^{(V)} - L^{(MM)}_{(B)}\vec{f}^{(M)} = -\vec{s}^{(M)}\,, \tag{41}$$

i.e., in the partitioned block-matrix notation,

$$\left(\begin{array}{cc} L^{(VV)}_{(A)} & L^{(VM)}_{(A)} \\ -L^{(MV)}_{(A)} & L^{(MM)}_{(A)} \end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c} \vec{f}^{(V)} \\ \vec{f}^{(M)} \end{array}\right) = \left(\begin{array}{c} \vec{r}^{(V)} \\ \vec{r}^{(M)} \end{array}\right) \tag{42}$$

and

$$\left(\begin{array}{cc} L^{(VV)}_{(B)} & L^{(VM)}_{(B)} \\ -L^{(MV)}_{(B)} & L^{(MM)}_{(B)} \end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c} \vec{f}^{(V)} \\ \vec{f}^{(M)} \end{array}\right) = \left(\begin{array}{c} \vec{s}^{(V)} \\ \vec{s}^{(M)} \end{array}\right)\,. \tag{43}$$

Equations (26) and (27) *alias* (42) and (43) may be finally re-read or generalized as a pair or multiplet of the real and linear matrix relations

$$\mathcal{A}\vec{f} = \mathrm{i}\,\vec{r}, \qquad \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}\vec{f} = \mathrm{i}\,\widetilde{\vec{r}}, \qquad \ldots \tag{44}$$

containing the same vector $\vec{f}$. By construction, the N^2 by N^2 matrices $\mathcal{A}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$ (etc) are all real.

We see that both the existence and non-existence of the real solution vector $\vec{f}$ (with N^2 components) remains admitted by the first-order perturbation approach. Obviously, no qualitative change in the conclusions is detected when one simplifies the mathematics and when one moves from the general case to the scenario with infinitesimally small non-Hermiticites. In other words, the transition from existence to non-existence of the metric still critically depends on the dynamical input encoded into matrices $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ as well as into vectors $\vec{r}$ and $\vec{s}$.

One could only add that the former, large-matrix part of the encoded dynamical input is determined by the self-adjoint zero-order components of the observables in Eqs. (23) and (24). It is worth noticing that the second, vectorial part of the input carrying the information about the non-Hermiticites seems more compact. This feature of Eqs. (44) should be attributed to the neglect of the higher-order $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$ terms in Eqs. (23) and (24).

7.3 Illustration: $N = 2$

For the sake of definiteness let us employ the row-wise vectorial compactification of matrices at the first nontrivial dimension $N = 2$ with $V = 3$, $M = 1$ and with the replacements

$$F_s = \begin{pmatrix} x & z \\ z & y \end{pmatrix} \to \vec{f}^{(3)} = \begin{pmatrix} x \\ z \\ y \end{pmatrix}, \quad F_a = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & p \\ -p & 0 \end{pmatrix} \to \vec{f}^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} p \end{pmatrix} \tag{45}$$

etc. Then, the most general choice of the Hermitian part of the dynamical input

$$A_s = \begin{pmatrix} a & c \\ c & b \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_a = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & d \\ -d & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{46}$$

leads to the following explicit N^2 by N^2 matrix form of Eq. (40),

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2d & 0 & -2c \\ -d & 0 & d & a-b \\ 0 & -2d & 0 & 2c \\ -c & a-b & c & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ z \\ y \\ p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} r_1^{(3)} \\ r_2^{(3)} \\ r_3^{(3)} \\ r_1^{(1)} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{47}$$

Once we compare the first and third line we may conclude that there exist no nontrivial components z and p (i.e., the metric remains trivial, diagonal) unless the non-Hermiticity A_1 in ansatz (23) and in relation (26) satisfies the "non-diagonality" constraint

$$r_1^{(3)} \ (= (R_s)_{11}) = -r_3^{(3)} \ (= -(R_s)_{22}). \tag{48}$$

Under the latter assumption we have just three linearly independent equations for the four real unknowns x, z, y and p so that, in accord with the expectations [40], the admissible two-by-two metrics will form a one-parametric family.

Presumably, the phenomenon of the non-existence of the metric might prove correlated, in the most popular and intuitive terminology of review [10], with the spontaneous breakdown of $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry, i.e., with the loss of the reality of some eigenvalues of the two-by-two complex-matrix candidate A for the observable.

An analogous elementary analysis has to be applied in the situation with $j_{max} = 1$ in which, under the non-triviality assumption (48) (plus under its $B-$related analogue), the three independent lines of Eq. (47) become complemented by their three independent $B-$related analogues marked, for the sake of simplicity, by tildas. With the latter

additional dynamical information at our disposal we arrive at the set of six equations

$$\left(\begin{array}{cccc} 0 & 2d & 0 & -2c \\ -d & 0 & d & a-b \\ -c & a-b & c & 0 \\ 0 & 2\tilde{d} & 0 & -2\tilde{c} \\ -\tilde{d} & 0 & \tilde{d} & \tilde{a}-\tilde{b} \\ -\tilde{c} & \tilde{a}-\tilde{b} & \tilde{c} & 0 \end{array}\right) \left(\begin{array}{c} x \\ z \\ y \\ p \end{array}\right) = \left(\begin{array}{c} r_1^{(3)} \\ r_2^{(3)} \\ r_1^{(1)} \\ s_1^{(3)} \\ s_2^{(3)} \\ s_1^{(1)} \end{array}\right). \tag{49}$$

In the next step the values of z and p get evaluated most easily. After their re-insertion (reflected by our adding a hat to the right-hand side vector elements) we are left with the following four linear equations for the last two unknowns,

$$\left(\begin{array}{cc} -d & d \\ -c & c \\ -\tilde{d} & \tilde{d} \\ -\tilde{c} & \tilde{c} \end{array}\right) \left(\begin{array}{c} x \\ y \end{array}\right) = \left(\begin{array}{c} \hat{r}_2^{(3)} \\ \hat{r}_1^{(1)} \\ \hat{s}_2^{(3)} \\ \hat{s}_1^{(1)} \end{array}\right). \tag{50}$$

In the generic case we have to avoid the non-existence of the metric, i.e., we have to impose the triple restriction

$$\hat{r}_2^{(3)}/d = \hat{r}_1^{(1)}/c = \hat{s}_2^{(3)}/\tilde{d} = \hat{s}_1^{(1)}/\tilde{c} \tag{51}$$

upon the dynamical input information. Then, the nontrivial solvability becomes guaranteed while, surprisingly, the one-parametric ambiguity of the shared physical metric will still survive. Obviously, its suppression would require either the choice of $j_{max} > 1$ or, perhaps, an inclusion of the second-order perturbation corrections in ε.

8 Summary

We may conclude (or find in Ref. [7]) that after one requires that a given pair of operators A and B with real and non-degenerate spectra represents two quantum observables, the specification of the $S-$superscripted physical Hilbert space via the definition of the metric Θ may be impossible, unique or ambiguous. An optimal scenario will be only realized in the case of uniqueness of the metric. Still, even in the presence of an ambiguity the authors of review [7] argued that our knowledge of *any* formally correct metric will be welcome, e.g., for variational-calculation purposes.

Such an optimistic version of pragmatic philosophy has been accepted in virtually all of the related literature. Still, some of the authors insisted on the optimality (i.e., uniqueness) of the metric [40]. Often, they believed that such a goal is rather easy to achieve. In our present paper we just decided to demonstrate that it is not always so.

The reasons and consequences have been explained in detail. In particular, we came to the conclusion that the straightforward, best known and successful suppression of the ambiguity of the metric via the identification of the second observable with a "charge" ($B = \mathcal{C}$ such that $\mathcal{C}^2 = 1$, etc) was exceptional, having been only rendered possible due to a number of additional, *ad hoc* assumptions (cf., e.g., [10] for all details).

Mathematically, one can characterize the choice of charge as a special implementation of the general recipe requiring (and, in an appendix of Ref. [7], explaining) the property of the so called irreducibility of the set A, B, ... of the quasi-Hermitian representations of the physical quantum observables. The latter property (requiring that the operators are all bounded) is, obviously, rather restrictive. Using a number of toy models we illustrated our proof that the successful transition to the theory containing more than one non-Hermitian candidate for the observable Λ_j may be considered rather rare and exceptional.

We may conclude that whenever one tries to work with the two or more independent and manifestly non-Hermitian candidates for quantum observables, the absence of the reliable (and, in general, difficult!) proof of the existence of the shared metric Θ should not be tolerated because it might really very easily result in the loss of the applicability of the entire sophisticated PTSQM formalism.

Acknowledgement

The participation of MZ was supported by IRP RVO61389005 and by the GAČR grant Nr. 16-22945S. The participation of IS and FR was supported by IRP RVO61389005 and by the CTU grants Nr. SGS15/215/OHK4/3T/14 and SGS16/239/OHK4/3T/14. HM and IL appreciate the financial support by the Algerian Ministry of education and research.

References

[1] http://www.emis.de/journals/SIGMA/Prague2009.html,
proceedings of conference AAMP 5 (May 27 - 28, 2009, Prague, Czech Republic).

[2] T. K. Jana and P. Roy, SIGMA 5 (2009) 083 (e-print overlay: arXiv:0908.1755).

[3] B. Bagchi and A. Fring, SIGMA 5 (2009) 089, (e-print overlay: arXiv:0908.2341).

[4] http://www.univ-jijel.dz/images/pdf/Affiche2016F.pdf

[5] H. Moulla, N. Mebarki and I. Leghrib, The q-Deformed Harmonic Oscillator, the poster presented during the 4-th Jijel Theor. Physics School "Topics in Quantum Physics and Path Integrals" (September 25 - 29, 2016).

[6] I. Leghrib and N. Mebarki, q-Deformed Swanson model, the poster presented during the 4-th Jijel Theor. Physics School "Topics in Quantum Physics and Path Integrals" (September 25 - 29, 2016).

[7] F. G. Scholtz, H. B. Geyer and F. J. W. Hahne, Ann. Phys. (NY) 213 (1992) 74.

[8] A. Messiah, "Quantum Mechanics", vol. I.North Holland, Amsterdam, 1961.

[9] M. Znojil, Phys. Lett. A 379 (2015) 2013.

[10] C. M. Bender, Rep. Prog. Phys. 70 (2007) 947.

[11] A. Mostafazadeh, Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys. 7 (2010) 1191.

[12] F. Bagarello, J.-P. Gazeau, F. H. Szafraniec et al., editors, "Non-Selfadjoint Operators in Quantum Physics: Mathematical Aspects". Wiley, Hoboken, 2015.

[13] F. J. Dyson, Phys Rev 102 (1956) 1217.

[14] J. Dieudonné, in Proc. Int. Symp. Lin. Spaces, Oxford, Pergamon, 1961, p. 115.

[15] C. M. Bender and S. Boettcher, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80 (1998) 5243.

[16] Miloslav Znojil, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 39 (2006) 441-456.

[17] M. Znojil, Conservation of pseudo-norm in PT symmetric quantum mechanics. Unpublished (arXiv math-ph/0104012), reprinted in Rendiconti del Circ. Mat. di Palermo, Ser. II, Suppl. 72 (2004), pp. 211 - 218.

[18] C. M. Bender, D. C. Brody and H. F. Jones, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89 (2002) 270401 and ibid. 92 (2004) 119902 (erratum).

[19] B. Bagchi, A. Banerjee, E. Caliceti et al., Int. J. of Modern Phys. A 20 (2005) 7107;
B. Bagchi, A. Banerjee and A. Ganguly, J. Math. Phys. 54 (2013) 022101.

[20] B. Bagchi and A. Fring, Phys. Let. A 371 (2009) 4307.

[21] S. Dey, A. Fring and L. Gouba, J. Phys. 45 (2012) 385302;
S. Dey and A. Fring, Physical Review D 86, 064038 (2012);
S. Dey and A. Fring Acta Polytechnica 53 (2013) 268-276;
S. Dey, A. Fring, L. Gouba, P. Castro, Phys. Rev. D87, 084033 (2013).

[22] M. Znojil, SIGMA 4 (2008) 001 (e-print overlay: arXiv:0710.4432v3).

[23] M. Znojil, Phys. Rev. D 78 (2008) 085003;
M. Znojil, Int. J. Theor. Phys. 52 (2013) 2038.

[24] M. Znojil, SIGMA 5 (2009) 001 (e-print overlay: arXiv:0901.0700).

[25] P. Siegl and D. Krejčiřík, Phys. Rev. D 86 (2012) 121702(R).

[26] F. Bagarello and M. Znojil, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 45 (2012) 115311.

[27] A. Mostafazadeh, Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A 371 (2013) 20120050.

[28] J.-P. Antoine and C. Trapani, "Metric Operators, Generalized Hermiticity and Lattices of Hilbert Spaces", in [12], pp. 345 - 402.

[29] T. Curtright, L. Mezincescu and D. Schuster, J. Math. Phys. 48 (2007) 092108.

[30] L. C. Biedenharn, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 22, L873 (1989);
A. J. Macfarlane, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 22, 4581 (1989);
C.-P. Su and H.-C. Fu, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 22, L983 (1989).

[31] A. Connes and J. Lott, Nucl. Phys. 18B (Proc. Suppl.) (1991) 29.

[32] A. Connes, Noncommutative geometry. Academic Press, New York, 1994.

[33] A. Connes, Noncommutative geometry and reality, J. Math. Phys. 36 (1995) 6194;

R. Banerjee, B. Chakraborty, S. Ghosh et al., Found. Phys. 39 (2009) 1297;

F. G. Scholtz, L. Gouba, A. Hafver et al., J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 42 (2009) 175303;

V. Galikova, S. Kováčik and P. Prešnajder, Acta Phys. Slovaca 65 (2015) 153;

Y. Ch. Devi, S. Prajapat, A. K. Mukhopadhyay et al., J. Math. Phys. 56 (2015) 041707.

[34] A. Mostafazadeh, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 39 (2006) 10171.

[35] V. Buslaev and V. Grecchi, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 26 (1993) 5541.

[36] A. Mostafazadeh, J. Math. Phys. 43 (2002) 205.

[37] H. Langer and Ch. Tretter, Czech. J. Phys. 54 (2004) 1113;

S. Albeverio and S. Kuzhel, "PT-symmetric Operators in Quantum Mechanics: Krein Spaces Methods", in [12], pp. 293 - 344.

[38] D. Krejčiřík, private communication (October 2016).

[39] M. Tater, private communication (October 2016).

[40] M. Znojil and H. B. Geyer, Phys. Lett. B 640 (2006) 52 and 649 (2007) 494 (erratum).